

### **REMARKS**

Claims 2, 15, 22, 24, 27 and 28 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4 to 6, 8, 9, 14, 15 and 17 to 28 remain active in this application.

Claims 2, 15, 22, 24, 27 and 28 have been amended to overcome the objections thereto.

Claims 1, 4 to 6, 8, 9, 14, 17 to 21, 25 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Halbert et al. (U.S. 5,623,232). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 requires, among other features, the step of locating the centroid of the semiconductor chip. No such step is taught or suggested by Halbert et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed. Other than the fact that the term "centroid" is mentioned in Halbert et al. this reference has nothing whatsoever to do with the invention as claimed. Nowhere in Halbert et al. is there any mention of locating the centroid of the chip. Rather, the centroid discussed in Halbert et al. relates to the location of thermal centroid of the transistors 1-4 which has nothing whatsoever to do with the centroid of the chip.

Claim 1 further requires the step of forming an op-amp having matched components in the semiconductor chip, the input stages of the matched components of the op-amp spaced apart and disposed at substantially the centroid of the semiconductor chip. No such step is taught or suggested by Halbert et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed. Nowhere is it stated that there are matched components in Halbert et al. and certainly there are no such components at the centroid of the Halbert et al. chip.

Claims 2 and 4 to 6 depend from claim 1 and therefore define patentably over Halbert et al. for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1 and therefore define over Halbert et al. for at least the reasons presented above with reference to the claims from which they depend.

Claim 14 requires, among other features, an op-amp in the die containing matched components having inputs spaced apart and disposed at substantially the centroid. No such feature is taught or suggested by Halbert et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claims 17 to 20 depend from claim 14 and therefore define patentably over Halbert et al. for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 14.

Claim 21 is the same as claim 1 except for increased breadth in being directed to a device rather than an op-amp. Accordingly, the arguments presented above with reference to claim 1 applies to these claims.

Claim 25 depends from claim 21 and therefore defines patentably over Halbert et al. for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 21.


The rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102 is not understood since the claim from which it depends (claim 23) is rejected under section 103. However claim 27 defines patentably over Halbert et al. for at least the reasons presented hereinbelow with reference to claim 23.

Claims 2, 15, 22, 24, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halbert et al. in view of Kirkpatrick II (U.S. 6,104,231). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims defines patentably over Halbert et al. for at least the reasons stated above with reference to the claims from which they depend since Kirkpatrick II does not overcome the deficiencies in Halbert et al. as demonstrated above.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)  
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)  
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)